

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the referenced application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 8 and 24 through 28 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been found objectionable for formal reasons. Claims 1 through 8 and 24 through 28 are again rejected under Sections 102 and 103.

Objection Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) The objection to claim 1 has been avoided by amending it to stand in independent form.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 The claims stand rejected under Sections 102 and 103. All of the rejections are evidenced by U.S. Patent 2,388,786 (Knight et al.) taken alone or in combination with various other references.

Since the premise of examiner's position is believed to be erroneous, all of the rejections are traversed.

Each of the independent claims requires the presence of an:

"extension useful for restricting ... movement of the laminate out of the channel".

Each independent claim further requires that this extension must be disposed:

"in parallel spaced relationship with the major exterior surface of the glass layer".

It is submitted that this structural arrangement is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the structure disclosed in the Knight reference.

Adverting to Figure 2 of the reference the channel 31 is seen as that portion of the frame B bounded by

the walls 22, 24 and 26 and partially closed by the lips 28 and 29.

In the Figure presented on page 4 of the Action the examiner has denoted a portion of the extension 18 using the arrow. As noted by the examiner, this portion of the extension does extend parallel to the major exterior surface of the glass 18, 19. However, this portion of the extension is not the feature of the extension that serves to restrict movement of the laminate out of the channel.

The portion of the extension 18 in the Knight reference that serves to restrict movement of the laminate out of the channel is the transverse head 20. The transverse head 20 is (by definition) transverse to the major exterior surface of the glass. It does not lie in parallel relationship with the major exterior surface of the glass.

Accordingly, the structure of the Knight reference is not seen to anticipate or render obvious the claimed subject matter, and all of the rejections based thereon are believed inappropriately drawn

For these reasons it is believed that this application stands in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any requisite fee to Deposit Account 04-1928.

Respectfully submitted,

**/GEORGE M. MEDWICK/**

ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE  
Registration No.: 27,456  
Telephone: (302) 892-7915  
Facsimile: (302) 992-5374

Dated: December 3, 2008